

Ship

FELLOWSHIP

December 1943



Vol. IX—No. 12

Bow down no more to Force or Fear,
Imposters in their proud apparel;
Love, our true Lord, lies cradled here;
Sing the triumphant Christmas Carol!

—W. R. HUGHES

Pacifism After the War

by

A. J. MUSTE

•

Reconciliation and Reality

by Roland H. Bainton

Is Conscription the Worst Evil?

by Milton Gordon

•

Footnote on Moscow

15 cents a copy

\$1.50 a Year

John Haynes Holmes

It is a sobering thought that the Christmas which comes this month is the fifth Christmas since the carnage of this present war began. 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943—thus the procession of the years rolls by. One wonders how many more Christmases must come and go before the day of peace dawns at last upon a ruined world.

It would seem as though this holiest of Christian festivals would have some effect upon the warring nations. That they would suspend hostilities on this one day, if only as a gesture of reverence to the Christ whom they at least profess to serve! That they would ponder possibilities of peace, if only in recognition of the central message of the Christmastide! That they would pledge themselves to the service of the "one world" of brotherhood, if only in proof that they are Christian in something more than name! But then one recalls that, on both sides of the battlefield, are nations, or at least governments (and it is governments that count in this war business!) that are not Christian even in name.

Soviet Russia, for example! Here is the first out-and-out atheistic government in history. Whether the Church has or has not been restored to favor in these war days, the fact remains that the Bolsheviks long since have repudiated religion in favor of an utterly materialistic philosophy of life, and have reared a whole new generation in ignorance of Christianity. If Stalin had his way, or at least were true to himself, there would not be a church nor an altar left in all the land which he rules with such absolute authority. So Christmas means nothing in Holy Russia, except as the ancient day is still remembered by priests and worshippers.

Christmas in Germany

The same thing is true of Germany, so far at least as the Nazis are concerned. Catholicism and Protestantism still survive in the Reich under conditions of contempt and cruel repression. For the government, which is the Nazi party, while not materialistic or atheistic like Russia, has developed a paganism as hostile to true Christianity as the ancient Roman paganism was hostile to the early Christianity of its day. That this paganism has made any permanent impression upon the minds of the German people is not to be believed, but that it is the center and soul of the Nazi horror, and has poisoned a whole generation of Nazi youth, is manifest. Christmas, therefore, in any real spiritual sense, is as null and void in Hitler's Germany as in the Mikado's Japan.

It means something when Christianity thus is definitely repudiated by states that have for centuries given homage to the Cross, and now offer this homage to the Hammer and Sickle and to the Swastika. Or does it mean—nothing? For where is there any difference, in the matter of their relation to war, between the Christian and the non-Christian nations? The Christian nations—England, the United States—are not so aggressive, perhaps because they already possess more than they want or need and thus no longer are tempted to do what England did to the South African republics in 1899-1902, and what the United States did to Spain in 1898-99. But these Christian nations, exactly like the non-Christian ones, recognize and resort to war in defense of their national interests, prepare for war as the main means to national security and honor, and wage war under that same hideous law of necessity that opens the way to every known horror of destruction and death. Whatever their desire for peace and their habit of appeasement, these so-called Christian nations are a part of the existing war system, and thus give their support to that philosophy of force and violence, central to all international relations, which in its essential nature is antithetical to everything that is basic to the gospel.

Expression of the Times

So it *does* mean something—this eruptive advent of non-Christian or anti-Christian philosophies of life into our hitherto Christian world! What if not that these philosophies are an expression of these times—an honest interpretation of what we practice as contrasted with what we profess? Certainly the stark materialism of Russia, with its reliance upon brute force and iron law, its emphasis upon sheer earthly power as the determining influence of existence, fits far more perfectly the current scene than any aspect of Christian faith. And the Nazi's Nordic gods, with their lust of battle and thirst for blood, have a contemporary relevancy unknown to the gentle and loving Nazarene. We *are* materialists, we *are* pagans—not otherwise could this war be fought for a single hour! It is as though, after two thousand years of hypocrisy in Christendom, the Soviets and Nazis had risen up to reveal us to ourselves and therewith to show the Christian world for what it really is. In their countries at least there will be no embarrassment on Christmas day!

Yet need we not despair, even of Christmas! For the faith of Christ, which with us is faith in Christ, lives

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF
RECONCILIATION

2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE } Editors
A. J. MUSTE }

R. ALFRED HASSLER
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Dorothy Detzer
Eugene Exman
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Amos B. Hulen
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Willis J. King
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Donovan E. Smucker
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly.
Reentered as second class matter
February 15, 1941, at the Post Office
at New York, N. Y., under the Act
of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy \$1.50 a Year

on today where in reality it has always lived—in the simple loving hearts of faithful men. All over this world, in lands Christian and non-Christian alike, there dwell those who believe in the Christian way of life. Nothing can shake their conviction that salvation was given to mankind when Jesus taught the commandment of universal love and dramatized its meaning on the cross of Calvary. Like the early Christians in the world-wide empire of Rome, these persons may seem to be a hopeless and helpless fragment of humanity. They are persecuted and outlawed, or just left alone in sheer contempt. But, like Paul, they are "not unfaithful to the heavenly vision." To their hearts, as to Bethlehem of old, come the Christmas angels. And there in full-throated joy, these angels sing again, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

December 1943



Vol. IX—No. 12

What does religious pacifism face after the war? What are its opportunities and dangers? This challenging article climaxes the recent "After the Armistice" series with a discussion of—

Pacifism After the War

By A. J. MUSTE

SINCE 1914 there have been two general tendencies or sets of forces that have increased in vitality and importance in a world where many things are in process of disintegration. One of these is totalitarianism in its various forms; the other is religious pacifism. It is not necessary to rehearse here the story of the growth of the former; it is necessary only to observe that no convincing evidence has yet arisen that this war will put an end to totalitarian trends.

As for religious pacifism, before 1914 the Christian and Jewish churches were hardly aware of the fact that their Scriptures and history contained a possible basis for a pacifist attitude toward war and the State. In the United States, though the prevailing theology and social ethics always had been Calvinistic, when war actually came nearly all church people acted on the Lutheran conception that once the State had decided upon war it was the duty of the Christian man to obey its mandate. Conscientious objectors were assumed, with little or no argument, to be heretics. There was a vague idea of the existence of such pacifist sects as Quakers, Mennonites and Dunkards, but it was built around the picture of the man on the Quaker Oats box: since these people wore broad hats and long hair, they might be expected to be queer in other respects also!

Since 1919 virtually all important denominations and the historic Oxford Ecumenical Conference have recognized that the pacifist position is at least one of those a Christian may take in conformity with the Scriptures and the Catholic tradition of the Church. It is very generally recognized that "God is the sole Lord of conscience" and that even in so great a matter as war, the Christian should not automatically accept the edict of the State, but must make his own decision as to the proper course to follow. Hence the general recognition of conscientious objectors by both Church and State. Where in World War I the author of *Preachers Present Arms* found less than a hundred American ministers outside the Historic Peace Churches

who maintained anything like a clear-cut pacifist position, today there are at least twenty times as many.

Even among the Peace Churches, it may be noted, their historic "peace testimony" was largely latent, something of which they were aware only vaguely, since it had not been challenged on a large scale for a century. The American Friends Service Committee did not exist in 1914, nor the Brethren Service and Mennonite Central Committees.

Such organizations as the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the War Resisters League are all post-1914 products.

Another illustration of this point is provided by the list of writers on whose books much of our pacifism is nurtured: Gandhi, C. F. Andrews, Kagawa, Aldous Huxley, Gerald Heard, Kirby Page, John Haynes Holmes, Richard Gregg, Vera Brittain, Laurence Housman, Rufus Jones, Allan Hunter, Allan Knight Chalmers, Muriel Lester, Stanley Jones. Nearly all their work has been done since 1914.

Gandhi, who of course is by far the most significant single figure in religious pacifism, began his work in South Africa in 1907, but he was not a national figure in India until after 1914 and it was not until 1919 that he became a figure of world stature or, for that matter, a full-fledged pacifist. Kagawa is similarly a post-World War I figure.

Pacifist Education Was Effective

So well-informed and competent an observer as Dr. F. Ernest Johnson of Teachers College, Columbia University, head of the Research Department of the Federal Council of Churches, has expressed the opinion that seldom if ever has a more effective job of education for a "cause" been done than that which resulted in the inroads of pacifism into the churches in the 1920's and '30's, and the continued powerful hold of pacifism on religious leaders in English-speaking countries during the present war.

(This is a good point to venture the guess that a much greater growth of religious pacifism may be looked for in the period following this war. Almost certainly disillusionment with the results and the aftermath of the war will set

in within a comparatively short time after open hostilities cease. For many this will mean relapse into cynicism; but for others conversion to pacifism and "never again." Should a virtual miracle occur and the nations adopt a course leading to a true and durable peace, that could only be as the result of a very general acceptance of proposals pacifists have been making all along and would increase rather than diminish the prestige of pacifism.)

Turning back to our parallel between the growth of totalitarianism on the one hand and religious pacifism on the other, at first thought it may seem anomalous that two such opposite trends should exhibit vitality and growth. A moment's reflection, however, will show that this is precisely what might have been expected. In a crisis, the "in-between" organizations and forces tend to disappear; those that take a clear stand with relation to the issue or issues underlying the crisis move to the front. The technological changes of our age have altered fundamentally the character of war and violent revolution. It is no longer possible to have a limited, nice, polite war or revolution or dictatorship. If there is war, it will be total war. The totalitarians saw this and did not seek to evade the implications. "Let it be total war and total terrorism," they said. The pacifists also faced the issue realistically and clearly stated that only by total renunciation of war could mankind escape suicide.

This leads directly into the main thesis of this article. Totalitarianism is more than commitment to all-out violence. It is a way of life and a social program, and out of these spring war. So is pacifism—the pacifism that will meet the need of this historic period and that will therefore flourish unless its own devotees fail it—a way of life and a social program out of which come renunciation of war and achievement of peace. In briefly setting forth this way and this program it is convenient and in many respects illuminating to make use of the example of Gandhi.

Gandhi's pacifism is essentially and profoundly religious and his program has an economic, a social and a political aspect. Each of these four items merits consideration.

Religious Pacifism Will Survive

In the first place, I am firmly convinced that the pacifism that will survive and prevail is religious pacifism. The reader may have noted that in the early paragraphs of this essay I used consistently the term "religious" to describe the pacifism that has experienced such a remarkable growth since 1914. This was done deliberately. In the period just before 1914 the labor and revolutionary movements in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe contained a powerful current of anti-militarism and even of pacifism, a pacifism which may, I think, be fairly characterized as predominantly secular though it owed much historically to religious inspiration and though, especially in England, these movements included a considerable number of avowedly religious pacifists. This secular pacifism did not survive the surrender of the labor and socialist organizations to nationalism in 1914. This is one of the reasons why, in spite of the growth of religious pacifism, governments this time encountered much less organized opposition from labor forces to their unfolding war program. I am also convinced that much of the vitality went out of these forces when they lost their anti-militarism and pacifism. Once again, it is religious pacifism which has stood the test.

What do we mean by "religious" in this connection?

Not a verbal profession of religion; not this or that dogmatic formulation; not adherence to this or that ecclesiastical institution. We do mean a pacifism rooted in one's conception of the nature of life, the universe, God. And, to quote from one of my other writings, pacifism "must be an inner experience, an inner attitude, a way of life, not merely a tool or device which the individual uses in certain circumstances on his environment. One must not only favor pacifism or non-violence as a policy in such and such circumstances, one must *be* a pacifist. . . . One after another our movements of reform and revolution break down because the human material in them is not equal to the task. . . . In the degree that the anti-war or pacifist movement is composed of individuals who have not themselves, to use Aldous Huxley's phrase, achieved detachment, who have not undergone an inner revolution, it too will experience the same failure to achieve self-discipline, integrity, true fellowship among its own members which has afflicted other movements for social change." Here is "the beginning of wisdom" for us as we face the convulsive closing period of another world war and its aftermath.

The Economics of Pacifism

In the second place, Gandhi's program includes an economic section. With its details I am not here concerned. Personally, I am of the opinion that at that point Gandhi is more vulnerable than at any other. But in the insistence that pacifism must have something to say about the organization of the daily economic life of human beings, we shall fail to follow him at our peril. It is simply not possible to deal intelligently with war in abstraction from national and international economic factors, any more than it is possible to deal sanely with the latter while leaving the War System untouched. Even more fundamental, if there is no fellowship in daily work, there is basically no fellowship at all. Communion is not real unless there is community; and there is no community without some sort of economic cooperation and sharing. All religious movements in their vital, creative days have illustrated this point.

Gandhi told Howard Thurman some years ago that when he found in his earliest non-violence campaigns that his people did not seem to have the stamina required to observe discipline and carry on to the end, he concluded that this was largely due to the fact that they simply did not have enough nourishing food to eat. It followed that merely propounding a new economic system which at some distant date would replace the existing one and provide a decent standard of living would not do; some way had to be found to remedy the situation promptly, at least in part.

In our program also it will not do merely to advocate an alternative economic system which will provide the masses with "pie in the sky" after "the revolution." We shall indeed not be able to avoid dealing with large-scale and long-term forces and problems if we are to have a "world order." We shall find ourselves increasingly active, I surmise, in such organizations as unions of farmers or industrial workers in our efforts to function effectively in the economic sphere. The pacifist movement has not given nearly enough consideration as yet to such matters to warrant our committing ourselves to any panacea, even if we assume that further study might lead to that! Nevertheless, as the Gandhian example suggests, we should devote considerable energy, perhaps even our main energies in this

field, to efforts at organizing economic life now along lines that are consonant with the pacifist philosophy and that give human beings bread and fellowship here and now. This points to activity in cooperatives and other "decentralist" enterprises.

Even those pacifists who may seemingly have to remain in conventional occupations in which they are largely enmeshed in an exploitative economy, are not excused from serious, indeed exacting efforts to bring their economic standards and daily practices in line with professed pacifist convictions. A secularist may logically work, let us say, for socialism while personally behaving as a thorough-going exploiting capitalist. Even so he will be deceiving himself. Socialists and Communists of an earlier day were constantly proclaiming that the new order was just around the corner. They never, most of them, really believed it. As soon as socialism seemed imminent social democrats ran away from it as fast as possible; and when Communists got political power, they set about building—totalitarianism! For those who had eyes to see they had been making it clear all along that they did not believe their own announcement, for they thought that the stupendous change in the outward order, the revolution, could take place without any appreciable change taking place in themselves at all—as if a fish could live as easily on land as in the sea! In any case, no one can honestly work for the coming of the Kingdom of God without trying to make his life *now* conform to its principles.

The Social Emphasis

A third emphasis in Gandhi's program is the social, viz., the elimination of untouchability. Of his work in this field Henry Noel Brailsford, a very keen critic who is on the whole not very sympathetic with Gandhi, has recently said: "Nothing in his long life has deserved the gratitude of mankind so certainly as his unflinching struggle against untouchability. In this he never rests and he never compromises, and in an astonishingly short time he has already gone far to break an oppression as ancient as the Brahman ascendancy." The obvious parallel in the program of American religious pacifism is the abolition of Jim Crow in all its forms and the realization of unreserved brotherhood in race relations.

As the FOR Council has recently pointed out, resolute action under the compulsion and inspiration of the great law and ideal of Brotherhood which is embedded in our religious and civic tradition, is the one program that holds real promise. Through faith in that law and ideal, and by the grace of God, whose will is Brotherhood, we can take such action.

The Christian churches above all must answer this call; level the barriers that have separated man from man, group from group, even at the Lord's Table; open roads for free intercourse among their members regardless of race; make straight in this desert a highway for our God.

In our local communities, schools, clubs, churches, unions, industries, professional and vocational groups, cooperatives, neighborhoods, we must develop normal friendly intercourse among all who have common interests and tasks, regardless of race or color. In every community there should be an interracial committee seeking out the points where discrimination is practiced, and eliminating such discrimination as the one sure way to prevent tension and conflict. The organizations which are combatting discrimination and

working for genuine democracy in race relations should be sought out and supported.

Nationally, let all progressive, liberal and democratic people and agencies unite for the following objectives:

1. Abolition of Jim Crow practices in the armed forces of the nation and in all departments of government—local, state and national. (Our proposal for the elimination of Jim Crow in the armed forces does not mean any alteration in our uncompromising opposition to all war; nor that we would approve of armies if only racial discrimination were not practiced in them. But racism must, we believe, be opposed wherever it is practiced, and the fatal contradiction at the heart of the present war is nowhere more clearly revealed than in our attempt to destroy the Hitler variety of Jim Crow by means of an army which is built on an American type of Jim Crow.)
2. Adoption of a National Fair Racial Practices Act.
3. Abolition of the poll-tax which disfranchises millions of our citizens, Negro and white.
4. Revitalizing of the Fair Practices Committee.
5. Repeal of Oriental Exclusion Legislation, and prompt relocation of Americans of Japanese descent in adequate jobs and hospitable communities.

We propose a positive, a morally aggressive, a total, a vigorously and relentlessly prosecuted program to end racist practices. There is no alternative but to try to carry out such a program—no alternative other than race war, chaos, and black night. There is no hope in any attempt to carry out this program in a spirit of hate toward any one or by violence. It requires the divine gift of love.

The Political Task

The fourth item in the Gandhian program is the political, and here of course his main objective is the removal by non-violence of foreign domination and the independence of India. It has already been made clear that this apparently negative item is only a part of his program. Let it be added that the struggle for independence is in fact no more negative than is the removal of a cancer from a vital bodily organ. It is only if the material and spiritual burden of foreign rule is lifted that the natural energies of a people can flow forth and produce those fruits which in the providence of God all life which is freed from arbitrary restrictions brings forth in profusion and infinite variety.

The major political task of a people under foreign rule is simpler and more obvious than the corresponding task for pacifists in a dominant nation like the United States. Yet it seems to me clear what that task is. There are two institutions which bind the masses in such a country and divert, thwart, or corrupt their energies in much the same way as the rule of the foreigner affects subject peoples. These institutions are the modern Absolutist State and the War System.

What I am suggesting at this point is based upon a differentiation, which is recognized as essential by many political scientists, between the Absolutist State on the one hand, and the government on the other hand. When people say that the Nazi or Fascist state must be destroyed, they obviously do not mean that there should be no functioning government in Germany or Italy. Within all modern nations, municipal and provincial or state governments exist, but their purpose is not to make war on each other and they do not claim an absolute authority over the bodies and souls of their citizens. They do not spend hundreds of billions of dollars periodically for war and send the youth

of each generation to slaughter. Government of some sort exists wherever human life goes on, but men have by no means always lived under Absolutist States.

The concept of the Absolutist State, on the other hand, goes back in part to the discredited and wholly undemocratic notion of the Divine Right of Kings. The Power-State in its current forms asserts an absolute control over persons which violates the sacredness of personality and is not necessary to secure the ends of good government; it exists essentially for the purpose of advancing "national interests" in the field of power by warfare, concealed or open; and claims a "sovereign" and unlimited right to determine for itself what those interests are and when and how it shall wage war against other states to advance these interests. This State and the War System are virtually one and the same thing. Most Americans see this clearly where Germany and certain other countries are involved. But the trend is everywhere the same, as a casual study of the budget of any one of these modern powers suggests. It is one of the reasons why, as I see it, conscription and war cannot in the present historical context be separated.

The realization that making war, including preparation to make war, is virtually the sole function of the modern Power-State leads to results that are of the utmost importance for the whole pacifist view of life and history. If it is war-making that constitutes the reason for existence of the Absolutist State, then if we do away with the War System, these States as such will also cease to exist. The character of their governments will change in ways which it is almost impossible to imagine when they no longer wage war and consequently no longer maintain armed forces and conscript human beings. There is no way to stop the trend toward centralization, mechanization and dictatorship if the War System continues; but with the lifting of that burden from human shoulders and with it the burden of fear from their souls, a great flowering of human energies would certainly occur. Men would associate naturally and freely in those activities which have always constituted the essence of human and civilized existence—the labor of tilling the soil, sowing the seed, reaping the harvest, baking the bread, weaving the cloth, building homes and schools and temples to the Eternal Spirit, the creative labor of science and art and communion with God.

All this has a bearing on the question of world government also. Men think in terms of a super-Absolutist State on a world scale—like Russia, Britain, Germany, the United States of today, only much bigger, with unlimited military force at its command. But that kind of State makes sense, can exist, only in a world where there is a rival state or states against which it is forever in a state of actual or concealed warfare. Take the War System out and there will be no such world state, and world government will be a simpler and more homelike thing than these modern monsters founded on naked power and existing for purpose of conflict. Keep the War System and there will not be any world government, but only a series of dominant powers holding sway for a season.

Pacifists will of course share with their fellows in many constructive activities of the community—local, state, national and international—having to do, for example, with education, the treatment of offenders against society, and the development of efficient and truly democratic instrumentalities to meet various public needs. The major distinc-

tive political task of religious pacifism, however, is by non-violent means, including non-cooperation, to undermine the power of the Absolutist State and the War System; for unless this is accomplished, these other efforts will have only limited success and will eventually be overwhelmed by the advent of totalitarianism.

A Pacifist Party?

When the American speaks of political action, he usually means taking part in elections and in the work of political parties. Then the question as to whether there should be a pacifist political party arises. Very little real thought has been given to this question and it is obviously impossible to deal with it in any but the most cursory fashion in a paragraph. The observations that follow are accordingly presented simply as a contribution to a discussion and in order to stimulate thought.

It may be that political parties as we know them are on the way out. They have disappeared in many lands. Even where they continue to exist in outward form, the contests between them tend to take on an air of unreality except in so far as they are contests for office and power. It is possible that the party system is one of the accompaniments of a certain type of economic system and disappears with it. Again, a national political party seeks to gain control over the national government, i.e., over the government of a war-making Power-State. But religious pacifists do not want control over such a state; they don't want such a state to exist at all.

May it be, then, that in so far as pacifists are interested in mass activity, their most hopeful field of work is in the mass-organizations of industrial workers, farmers and minority groups rather than in political parties, winning these organizations to acceptance of the spirit and methods of non-violence? Certainly a very important phase of our work is there. And that for the rest it is in the carrying out of productive economic functions which minister to human needs—as farmers, workers, engineers, technicians, physicians, housewives, consumers—through cooperatives and in other ways that religious pacifists may exercise true and beneficent power in modern life.

One concluding observation. I have written throughout of what may be termed a social-activist religious pacifism. I do not think it is the only kind; and those who lean toward it are ever in danger of becoming negative, aggressive, absorbed in external results. Nevertheless I am convinced that such pacifism is essentially the Jewish-Christian prophetic faith and world view adapted to and acting in the modern historic period. Most men of faith in this age will, I believe, have to work in the world, not in retirement from it, and will have to function corporately, collectively, rather than as individuals working primarily by force of personality, example and contagion. They will have to take upon themselves the awful responsibility of "the good" in the immortal closing lines of the MacNeill-Auden's "Their Last Will and Testament":

To the good who know how wide the gulf, how deep
Between Ideal and Real, who being good have felt
The final temptation to withdraw, sit down and weep.
We pray the power to take upon themselves the guilt
Of human action, though still as ready to confess
The imperfection of what can and must be built;
The wish and power to act, forgive and bless.

Reprints of *Pacifism After the War* are available at five cents each.

Is Conscription the Worst Evil?

By MILTON GORDON

Assignee, CPS Camp No. 12

THE distinction suggested by Donald W. Calhoun in the June issue of *Fellowship* between an act of *conscription*, which applies to the "general" life activity of the individual, and *specific restrictions* on particular phases of the individual's existence, is a good one. Quite correctly he points out that conscription, involving, as it does, "the entire vocational life enterprise of mature individuals," must be clearly separated from such desirable restrictive actions of the state as public health measures, compulsory education, enforcement of taxation, control of wages, hours, and conditions of work, and the like.

Moreover, this writer would agree with his further conclusion that total conscription, as thus defined, must be considered antithetic to the Christian-democratic creed, which envisages the good of the individual as the goal of social endeavor. Having granted this, however, we must go on to deny the inevitability of Mr. Calhoun's final and most challenging conclusion: that pacifists must make their ultimate and decisive stand at the point of conscription rather than of warfare. "Those who separate the two," he declares, "are giving succor to both the anti-religious and the anti-democratic philosophy." This is a strong charge, and in view of the fact that over six thousand conscientious objectors are still within the Civilian Public Service System, thus partially accepting conscription, must be considered carefully.

Donald Calhoun's thesis, stated succinctly, would run something like this:

Pacifists consider war as an evil (opposed to the Christian-democratic creed); therefore they refuse to comply with its demands and are prepared to take whatever consequences this refusal may entail. In other words, they make a final and decisive stand against it, saying, "I will not fight—kill me if you must"—the ultimate in resistance, so to speak. Conscription is also an evil (opposed to the Christian-democratic creed). Therefore pacifists must make a decisive stand against this institution, too. The logical step here would be a refusal to register or to go to a CPS camp.

The fallacy in this thesis, it seems to me, arises from the failure to recognize two underlying points:

a. *There are degrees of evil; and degrees of drasticness and ultimateness, so to speak, with which one may oppose evil, and*

b. *We live in a world which is full of institutions and social patterns that are evil (contrary to the Christian-democratic creed), and these evil patterns constantly surround us.*

Let us consider the second point first. As residents of the United States of America we make our livelihood in a land whose basic economic system of private enterprise for profit, with its resulting inequalities of income, and extreme poverty and material insufficiency for millions, is surely unchristian and undemocratic. We live in a land where patterns of racial segregation and exploitation are surely

unchristian and undemocratic. We pay taxes to support a penal system which, based as it is on theories of retribution and punishment, is surely unchristian and undemocratic. In our home localities, every day, we pass by slum areas whose existence constitutes a flaming rebuke to the teachings of Christ and the principles of democracy. And this point of the omnipresence of evil obviously could be extended either outward into the other areas of the world or inward into more immediate situations. What, then—and this brings us back to the first point—are the only reasonable methods we have of opposing these evils.

The human individual, living in a world where evil is omnipresent, and being not omnipotent, makes distinctions between degrees of evil, and adopts methods embodying varying degrees of opposition to these evils on the basis of these distinctions and his own limitations. Obviously, to make a drastic and ultimate non-cooperation stand against all the evil in the world would mean, for the pacifist, to announce to, let us say, all the political leaders of the various states of the world, "Abolish the evils in your nations and set up a Christian-democratic society, or I shall fast unto death." This may sound absurd, but it is a logical *reductio* of the thesis that all that is evil demands an ultimate kind of opposition.

Actually, of course, no sane person takes such a drastic step. What he does is to make the distinctions mentioned previously, and temper his opposition accordingly. Thus he may work for socialism, attempt to influence prison authorities to improve penal conditions, and engage in educational activity in an effort to better racial relations. When conscription threatens, he may work desperately through his representatives in Washington to prevent it. He will, of course, grade these particular evils according to his estimate of the degree of their evil, and throw the greatest weight of his efforts accordingly.

The peculiar distinction of the pacifist is that, deeming war the greatest of evils, he makes his final and ultimate opposition at the point of engaging in warfare. "I cannot cooperate with you here," he says, "to the point of death or whatever your penalty happens to be." On the positive side he offers alternative service, a more equitable social and economic program, and an ethic which he claims would do away with the causes of war. But by virtue of his inevitable limitations as a solitary human being, the immediate effectiveness of his ultimate form of opposition is simply that he accomplishes his disengagement from waging war. According to the mores of the society where he lives, he is either done away with, put in prison, or given some form of alternative service.

Now Mr. Calhoun's answer to this might be the reiteration of the statement made in his article that "opposition to conscription grows as essentially out of pacifist faith as does opposition to war"—in other words, conscription is so closely related to war that the ultimate stand should be made here at this point, rather than further on, at the point

of actual induction into the army. Our reply to this viewpoint is this: If the pacifist seeks an evil prior to the evil of actual participation in warfare against which to make his ultimate stand, he might do better to make this stand against the institution that is more fundamentally and causally related to warfare than is conscription, namely the economic system that results in want and frustration within and among nations, and which thus brings on warfare.

Conscription is not by any means the sole cause of war—it plays into the hands of war but other factors may be more basic causes of war and totalitarianism. To focus attention on conscription too exclusively is almost to ignore the more fundamental relationship between a world-wide unchristian and undemocratic economic system and war-

fare—yes, even between such an economic system and slavery. For let the pacifist remember this: A debased and impoverished early environment, existent in a culture that wears the cloak of political freedom, can make a slave out of a man as truly as any conscription system ever invented.

In a world full of evil institutions and patterns, then, the pacifist who accepts CPS, deciding that a fast to bring on socialism would hardly be effective at the moment, makes his ultimate stand of non-cooperation at the point of engagement in war, and goes on as best he can, with the limited means that are at any one man's disposal, to work for the positive goals that will eventually mean the disappearance of the basic causes of violence between men and nations.

Reconciliation and Reality

By ROLAND H. BANTON

Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale Divinity School

I

THE Fellowship of Reconciliation by its very name is committed to the task of reconciliation, yet of late we are accused, along with other pacifists, of being more irritating than healing. The charge is levelled, more often than not, as a result of the use we make of certain facts.

For instance, there is the matter of the war as a method of achieving certain ideals. Many of us based our refusal to "support" the war on the conviction that war cannot be relied upon to achieve ideal objectives. Now, say our accusers, whenever any evidences appear that the war actually is failing in this regard, we gloat over the fulfillment of our predictions and cry, "I told you so."

In other cases, it is said, we refuse to deal honestly with the facts. We have claimed that war cannot be fought without hate, and now, they say, although this war is being fought with much less hate than was the last, we have become the scavengers of hate in order to corroborate our analysis.

More devastating is the claim that we ought not to concern ourselves with facts at all because, although an occasional fact may seem to confirm our position, in the long run most of the facts will demolish our contentions. From this point of view, the pacifist who takes his stand without regard to any facts about the consequences of his course, is thought to be foolish but respectable, while the one who pretends by his stand to alter events and modify facts, is not only foolish but fatuous.

So the first question is whether we have any concern with the facts at all. The answer depends, of course, on the nature of our pacifism. There are varieties of pacifism that are above all facts.

For instance, the *holiness* type of pacifism objects to killing as defiling. Here we find an underlying assumption

that the body is evil and that contact with it, and particularly with blood and the dead body, is contaminating.

An additional motive for pacifism is supplied in those religions which regard the entire material world as so evil that the object of religion must be to escape completely from this life. One might suppose that from this point of view war could be regarded as a boon, since it terminates so many lives. But such is not the inference, apparently since war is a struggle of body against body. Instead, the way of emancipation should be the way of contemplation and asceticism.

These attitudes are found in the Jain religion, which may form something of the unconscious background of Gandhi. In connection with Christianity, pacifism of this type has appeared in Gnosticism, Manichaeism and Catharism. However, it is not a Christian view of the world and has been rejected as heretical. Plainly this type has no concern for the facts in the sense of the social consequences of non-resistance.

Another variety of pacifism equally unconcerned as to its effects is *legalistic*, based on the command of God, "Thou shalt not kill" or the precept of Christ to turn the other cheek. The Christian has these orders from the Heavenly Commander. He dare not disobey, though the heavens fall. His not to reason why, nor to ask what will happen; that is for God to determine. And commonly the expectation is that God *will* determine; he will come with an outstretched arm to vindicate his people. Legalistic pacifism usually finds solace in millenarianism. As an example, consider the Jehovah's Witnesses. One does not expect them to debate the historical consequences to be expected from a war!

But a third type of pacifism is *utilitarian* and optimistic. It cannot avoid a consideration of consequences. The primary ground for this variety of pacifism is optimism with regard to the responsiveness of man to fair dealing, reason,

magnanimity, forgiveness, and constructive help. To such treatment, it says, Hitler himself might respond. Or, if he is too much of a madman to be open to any such plea, then his people might respond. If circumstances leave no alternative but to resist a foe, then the resistance should be non-violent, accompanied by self-suffering.

Such a tactic, says this variety of pacifism, produces less resentment than does violent opposition and leaves the door open for reason. It may melt the heart of the tyrant; it may advertise the cause and draw adherents to itself. War, on the other hand, unites the foe, blocks negotiation, destroys untold treasures of wealth and life, and leaves in its wake poverty, famine and chaos. War can achieve no ideal ends. It may depose a tyrant and leave the room swept and garnished for seven other devils to enter in.

Such utilitarian pacifism is not necessarily incompatible with an absolute, for if this be an orderly universe under the control of God—as the Christian believes it is—then that which is absolutely wrong because it is contrary to the very grain of reality, may be expected to have deleterious consequences. Nevertheless, a distinction must be drawn between a course of action that must be followed no matter what happens, and a course that is justified on the basis of its probable effects.

Those pacifists who have taken their stand on such utilitarian grounds *must* scrutinize effects of various lines of conduct. God forbid that we should do so in a spirit of gloating. Heaven defend us from saying, "I told you so." *But if the war is not doing what was claimed for it, that is a fact!* It is a fact for our critics as for ourselves. There is no lack of charity in calling to their attention facts that corroborate our predictions. Perhaps it may still be true that the facts as a whole are against us, but if some facts appear to be for us, pacifists and coercionists must face them together.

II

Two specific facts in recent years call for sober reflection. One of them came to mind on rereading after two years the poignant statement by Maude Royden of the reasons she had abandoned her former pacifism and endorsed England's entry into the war. Tyranny must be resisted. England had neither the spiritual strength nor discipline to resist in any other way than by force of arms. Therefore, England must fight, and pacifists must silence their scruples and help her to fight successfully. Miss Royden quoted the word of a man who said, "I used to be a pacifist. I now know that I would rather go to hell for fighting than have my son brought up to think that it was funny to kick a Jew in the stomach."¹

The reading of such a plea left one for the moment utterly dumb. Silence seemed the only fitting response from one on this side of the water, removed by circumstance from the suffering. Yet reflection could not but return. Although England did go to war *in part* to prevent children from being brought up to think it funny to kick a Jew in the stomach, and although the United States went to war *in part* for the same reason, nevertheless it appears that three million Jews have been wiped out on the Continent of Europe, and anti-semitism is on the increase in America!

Similarly, food for reflection is provided by a rereading

of the manifesto issued in January, 1940, by thirty-two prominent churchmen, who upbraided the "ignorance or moral confusion" of those who interpreted the war "merely as a clash of rival imperialisms" and failed to see that "justice, freedom of thought and worship, and international cooperation which are fundamental to a Christian world order" would be precluded in case of a victory by Japan, Germany and *Russia*.²

Now while we cannot ignore such facts, we need still to guard carefully the manner of our speech. Particularly we do well to be cautious in referring to our way as the Way of the Cross. The words are hollow if we are not actually suffering. Our claim that the Way of the Cross may have significant social consequences may be perfectly valid, but some persons are in a better position to point it out than others.

Again we should be cautious about identifying non-violent coercion with the Cross. They are not identical. The Cross was a witness, come what might. It was the outcome of a course of action that left no alternative save capitulation or suffering. Non-violent coercion may have the same outcome, but a course of action that may lead to a cross is not itself the Cross.

One cannot quite think of the Cross as a strategy to be turned on or off with an eye to results. Consequences there may be, tremendous consequences. Or, on the other hand, the martyr may sink unrecognized beneath the wave. He cannot determine his course in the light of a predictable outcome. He can only say, "I cannot do otherwise." The strategy of non-violence, of itself, is not precisely that.

III

As for hate in war and our disposition to discover it where it does not exist, God forgive us if ever we have done so. What the facts may be is difficult to determine. Moods do not readily yield to statistics. But everyone felt in the last war that there was less hate in the trenches than in the sewing circles of the Middle West. Those who come into personal contact with the enemy recognize him as a fellow sufferer. Moreover, those who fight at great distances, as much of this war is fought, may do so impersonally. Those who are fighting at all, and not worrying at home, are less likely to hate because they have some other outlet for their emotions.

We are told that in this war hate in England is slight, and less in bombed London than in the untouched villages. China appears to be amazingly free from hate. A striking example of a better attitude in this war than in the last is provided in a story published in *Britain* for September, 1943. In condensed form the story is this:

Jack Aistrop was a corporal with the British forces in France before Dunkerque. The story he tells is of a German prisoner, a young aviation officer, who was brought in and stood before Jack's desk. Jack continues:

"Sit down," I said.

His boyish face flushed. "I am an officer," he spat at me. "Why do you not stand up when I speak to you? I shall report you to your superiors."

I stood up. "There, is that better? Won't you sit down now. How about some tea or coffee?"

He sat down carefully. "No. Send for your officers immediately, Corporal, I will wait."

¹ *Christian Century*, April 16, 1941.

² *Christian Century*, January 31, 1940.

I couldn't repress a smile. He'd wait!
Instantly he was on his feet again. "Stand up!"
I sat still. "Now, now," I said. "Why don't you sit down and have some tea and a cigarette? You must need them both. Come on, now."

He listened in silence. When I had finished, he leaned calmly across the table and punched me in the mouth. My lips began to bleed immediately and I bit my tongue. But I sent a private for two mugs of tea and some cigarettes.

"Now, will you sit down or would you like to remain standing so that you can take a smack at me if the mood hits you?"

He sat down. I wiped the blood from my lips.

"It's a lovely morning, isn't it?" I said.

He stared at me. "Yes, it is a lovely morning."

"This is a nice part of the country, but of course you won't be staying long. You'll be going to England. I hope you have a nice crossing. . . . Where are you from?"

"Hamburg. And you?"

"London. But tell me, have you always lived in Hamburg? Do you know it well?" Hamburg! My heart beat faster and there was something trembling on the tip of my tongue.

"I was born there and educated there."

"Moorende, Hamburg 26, you know it then? You know Professor Schmidt and—his daughter?"

"I did. They are dead. Killed by your murdering R.A.F. Like many other innocent people. The professor taught me when I was a young boy."

"How well did you know her?"

"Not very well. Not so well as her friend, Magda von Diegel. She too was killed."

"I knew them both, very well. When they were in England on a student exchange."

His features relaxed and he was an ordinary young man again.

"I remember." He was excited now. "Your school sent two girls over and mine sent two to yours. How strange it is to meet you like this. You must know then, Evelyn Boucher and Jean Bains."

"Of course. They were the two who went to Hamburg."

I pushed the cigarettes over to him and we both smoked a few minutes in silence.

"Evelyn was killed in a raid on London. Jean is serving in the A.T.S., the British women's service. I was brought up with both of them. But tell me about the professor's daughter."

"There is nothing to tell. Why are you so interested?"

"Why are you interested in Evelyn and Jean?"

A guilty look crossed his face.

"They are nothing to me, but I am naturally interested in them, despite the fact that they are my enemies."

"The professor's daughter and Magda and all of the other young people I met in Hamburg, then, are my enemies?"

"Of course."

"You fool. You poor stupid fool. They aren't my enemies. They are my friends—part of everything I believe in—they are no more enemies of mine than you are. Hitler is my enemy and the swine who stand behind Hitler."

He was on his feet again.

"If you raise your hand again, I shall smack you right in your silly officer's face. I shall knock hell out of you."

"I shall report you to your superiors. I do not wish to speak to you again." He seemed to be swaying on his feet as he spoke. Then suddenly he collapsed across the table.

I hauled him onto his chair and took his tunic off. There was a dark stain of blood on his left shoulder, so I cut off his sleeve. There was a dirty wound in the outer part of his arm, near to the shoulder.

Jack sent for the medical corps, but much time was spent in reaching the right person by telephone. In the meantime the German came to.

"Why do you stare at me?"

"I was thinking."

"Ah so? And what were you thinking?"

"About those student exchanges. About those girls. I suppose it can all be only about five years ago. Five years, and it seems so long. I used to talk to the professor's daughter a lot. We used to spend all of our holidays together roaming around London, and we used to talk all the time. In those days we believed in young people; we thought that we were sort of crusaders—you know the sort of bunk—hands across the seas—youth to youth in every country. What kids we were. We even started a friendship movement; you know the idea—kids in one country to kids in another and gradually enlarging the circle of correspondents by sending lists of addresses in their letters."

His face flushed and his eyes came alive.

"I remember; and we used to send postcards and magazines and books to each other. I was the secretary of the Hamburg branch. I and Magda between us. I was sixteen then."

It was getting cold, and I put my greatcoat around his shoulders.

We sat in silence for a while.

He broke it. "If I had been in your position," he said, "I should have refused to fight for the capitalists of Britain; I should have preferred to have died rather than go to war with a country that only wanted peace."

"You should say that," I shouted. "Why you cheeky young devil, Germany has been making plans to smash everything that was worth while in the world for years. Your prancing Hitler and his cut-throats had every move planned in advance."

"Remember that you are talking to an officer, Corporal. Be careful of what you say or I shall report you to your superiors."

"I'm getting tired of hearing you say that." I was at white heat with anger. "The fact that you are an officer in the German forces is nothing to be proud of; what are you apart from butchers of women and kids?"

He made no reply. The ambulance arrived. I helped him to it.

He felt so thin and cold that my hate for him suddenly evaporated. I opened the back door of the ambulance.

"Good-bye," I said. "It might all have been different if we had only been more sensible when we were younger; perhaps we could have done something then."

He stood there for a second or two, clutching the door rail with his right arm.

"It might have been possible," he said coldly.

Then mockingly he forced his injured arm up into the salute; I could feel the pain of it in the pit of my stomach.

"Heil Hitler!" he shouted.

I shoved him in and slammed the door on him.

The next day I sent him some books and my private store of cigarettes. They wouldn't let me into the hospital; it was unheard of. In any case, they said, they were operating on him; gangrene had set in.

For five days I haunted that hospital, waiting for news. I didn't understand myself or my thoughts.

And on the sixth I went sick to avoid burial party duty and because I knew that if I helped to bury him some part of some intangible thing that belonged to him and me and millions like us would go into the grave and under the earth with him.

And I didn't want that to happen. I watched the little ceremony from the hillside and I prayed to God never to let that happen.

This is the tragedy that we of the Fellowship above all must recognize. These poor lads have been dragged into that which they loathe with all their souls. They see no other way out than to do what they are set to do. God have mercy on us if we make their motives lower than they are.

News from the Peace Front

COs in Two Prisons On Work, Hunger Strikes

Conscientious objectors in two federal prisons are "on strike" in protest against certain regulations of which they disapprove. In the Danbury (Conn.) Correctional Institution COs have been on a sustained work strike since August 18. Nineteen men are now engaged in this action, which was taken in protest against racial segregation in the prison dining-hall. The Lewisburg (Pa.) prison is the scene of a hunger strike begun September 29, in which six men are now participating. The Lewisburg group is protesting censorship of mail and reading matter. All six are being tube-fed in the prison hospital.

The Danbury men, who carried on negotiations with the administration for six weeks before calling the strike, have asked that the present segregation of whites and Negroes in the dining-hall be discontinued, but that special provision be made for white prisoners who do not wish to sit at the mixed tables. To the claim of prison authorities that such an arrangement would precipitate a riot, they have replied that a large proportion of the prison population consists of conscientious objectors and Negroes, who would not object, and that only twelve white prisoners are known to disapprove of the proposed arrangement. They point out also that segregation is not followed throughout the prison routine, and that no difficulties are encountered in unsegregated work, recreational and educational facilities, or religious services.

The Danbury strikers are kept in individual cells in a separate section of the prison for twenty-three hours a day, and are allowed out only for a daily forty-minute "yard period." Although they are permitted the usual reading, library, and correspondence privileges, they are said also to be on a restricted diet.

The Lewisburg Strike

The action at Lewisburg also began as a work strike directed against racial segregation, but the fast launched on September 29 is intended as a protest against censorship of mail and reading matter. Six men are taking part in it; eight, including some of the fasters, are still continuing the racial protest.

The hunger strikers point out that they do not object to inspection of mail for the purpose of detecting dope

or possible escape plots, but only to restrictions on their right to express their opinions in their letters.

Meanwhile Igal Roodenko, CO at Mancos (Government) CPS camp, was arrested and held in \$3,500 bail after twelve days of refusing both to work and to eat in sympathy with the Lewisburg strike, and ten COs in the Ashland (Ky.) prison also engaged in an eight-day "sympathy fast." A committee of COs in Big Flats (N. Y.) CPS camp called on men in other camps across the country to join them on December 8 in an "expression of unity" with imprisoned COs. The committee suggested that the day might be given over to "silent periods of contemplation and meditation and perhaps fasting or participating in frugal meals," with a service in the evening.

War Victims Fund

Five thousand dollars coming from FOR mite boxes, special gifts and savings effected by fasting, have been distributed by the Fellowship's War Victims Fund, since September 1942, to war sufferers in France, Switzerland, Greece, China, England, Mexico, and to Japanese-Americans in the United States.

The distribution has been managed with almost no overhead cost to us through the cooperation of various agencies, as follows:

American Friends Service Committee, for FOR project at Le Chambon, France...	\$1,000.00
Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe, for FOR Relief Fund in Lausanne, Switzerland	2,000.00
Near East Foundation, for children in Greece.....	500.00
American Friends Service Committee, for civilian relief in China.....	500.00
War Resisters International, for child refugees in England	250.00
Professor José Brocca, for Spanish refugees in Mexico	100.00
FOR Japanese - American Travel Loan Fund.....	650.00
	\$5,000.00

Hearst Papers Call FOR Meetings "Love Rites"

Rioting of several hundred internees in the Tule Lake (Calif.) segregation camp for "disloyal" Japanese and Japanese-Americans, out of which developed an investigation by the State Legislature, has given rise to fantastic stories levelled against members of the Fellowship on the staff of the camp. Testimony of teachers and administrators before the committee, in which the Fellowship belief in brotherhood and good will was mentioned, was distorted by some of the Hearst newspapers into stories of an imaginary organization whose "white women" members engaged in "love rites" with Japanese men. Some newspapers also carried accounts that implied that Fellowship members encouraged the internees to engage in violence and rioting.

A statement to the press, released by the national office of the FOR in New York, branded the accusations as "definitely not true." Declaring that the organization, while consistently opposing the policy of evacuation nevertheless recognized the need to take into custody "dangerous enemy aliens or law violators," the statement pointed out that Tule Lake also contains hundreds of loyal children and young people whose parents requested post-war repatriation to Japan. "Interested Caucasians need to work with these people," the statement continued, "helping to keep the loyal ones from growing bitter toward white Americans, and helping to change the attitude of others."

There are ten members of the FOR who hold positions on the teaching staff of seventy-five at the Center, which has been under the control of the War Relocation Authority until the rioting early in November, when army troops were called in.

COs in Prison Hold FOR Conference

Conscientious objectors serving time in a southwestern federal prison held their own FOR annual conference the week end of November 6 and 7, complete with printed—in pencil—programs. The conference included periods of worship and meditation, panel and open discussions, and recreation and "get-acquainted" sessions. Subjects of study and discussion were racial tensions, social work, cooperative farming, labor, education, the church, and "camp problems."

The program pointed out that transportation, board, and lodging were being provided "through the kindly cooperation of the government," and that all expenses might be earned "by working not more than five years on the public road."

Friends Unit in China Aids Sick Villagers

Into a little Hakka village which seemed very foreign to anyone from the Western world, went members of the Friends medical team. One of the doctors describes the visit: "My advent causes considerable excitement and the Hakka are just as eager as other Chinese to come and stand close to the funny man and point out his peculiarities and giggle and generally enjoy themselves at his expense. It is not difficult to raise a laugh in a crowd of the children. The simplest way is to start laughing oneself. This at once evokes shrieks of delighted merriment from one's audience."

There are many children among the doctor's patients: "Two days ago a boy of seven came with a whole row of neglected abscesses on his face and scalp. He looked very sick. I incised four of these abscesses, using no anaesthesia. He shed a few tears. Next morning he was much better but I had to open a fifth abscess. He let me do this without moving or making a sound. This morning he came into the room alone and lay down at once as if for further incisions, which fortunately were not necessary.

"Many of the patients have skin troubles. As a rule there are three diagnoses—ringworm, scabies and ulcers of the leg. The ringworm is not typical but sometimes is very extensive. We see scabies in its grossest forms, though the worst cases occur among the soldiers rather than the villagers. A man will come to us all covered from the neck downward with scabs. Sometimes the whole surface of the body is covered with scales. The sufferers are invited to attend a 'Scabies Clinic' on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday afternoons and to bring clean clothes with them. They have a bath first and are then rubbed all over with our ointment and the worst cases get better."

CPS men serving mental patients at the Eastern State Hospital, Williamsburg, Virginia and at the Southwestern State Hospital, Marion, Virginia report the desperate need of attendants for women patients, and urge pacifist women to volunteer. Women attendants are paid \$35 per month plus maintenance, plus overtime above 54 hours weekly. Laundry and emergency medical and dental care are included in maintenance.

Friends of conscientious objectors in prison are permitted to send Christmas cards to the men whether or not they are among the seven "approved correspondents" normally permitted by prison authorities.

Pacifist Seeks Office

Defying government censorship of pacifist publications, A. C. Barrington, honorary national secretary of the New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society (FOR), recently ran for election to the House of Representatives. In the course of his campaign he was able to print and distribute election folders that presented the entire pacifist position. He pointed out that "the other 79 members can run the war—elect at least one man free to devote all his energy to winning the peace." No word has been received of the success of his campaign.

PRB Wants Workers For Research Projects

The Pacifist Research Bureau, sponsored jointly by the Fellowship and other peace organizations, is in need of persons to work either in its Philadelphia office or in the areas where they now reside. The Bureau has prepared a list of research projects that it hopes to undertake, but which are now held up for lack of help. Full information about these projects may be had from the Bureau's director, Harrop Freeman. The PRB has offices at 1201 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Revolutions Move Fast!

The world is in one of its great revolutionary periods, and events are moving with a speed that leaves most of us breathless. To help the people who are too busy to keep up, we have introduced the —

FELLOWSHIP STUDYBOOKS

These books will come out at intervals. They will cover a variety of topics, written by men and women who know their subjects. Brief, readable, yet authoritative, they are ideal

for "catching up" on what's going on in the world. Each of them will be well illustrated, and they will sell for 25 cents per copy. Here are some of the titles you may expect:

1. PATTERN FOR PEACEMAKERS

Men's dream of a better world — what it implies and the problems that must be overcome. By *R. Alfred Hassler*. Now available.

2. EXIT EMPIRE

The relationship between militarism and imperialism, and what is likely to happen to the colonies when the war ends. By *Vernon Nash*. Now on the press; ready about December 15.

3. THE NEXT PEACE

The political aspects of the coming peace, including analysis of the Moscow Conference, and other publicized peace plans, the dangers of isolationism and of a dictated peace, and the basic principles of enduring peace. By *R. Alfred Hassler*. Ready about January 15.

4. IT'S MORE FUN TOGETHER

What lies behind America's racial tensions, the dangers involved in them, and ways in which individuals can help to solve this tremendous problem. By *Lillian E. Smith*. Ready about March 1.

AND OTHER BOOKS TO COME

Other subjects to be considered include the economic problems of enduring peace, the question of labor, propaganda in wartime, and many others.

Make sure of getting every one —

You can be sure of getting these books by subscribing in advance at the low rate of five studybooks for \$1. Send one dollar with your name and address to

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

2929 Broadway

New York 25, N. Y.

Footnote on Moscow

The New York Times said of the Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and Russia held in Moscow October 19-30, 1943: "The results of the Moscow Conference exceed the most optimistic hopes, and must be hailed as a great victory for the United Nations, matching any victory yet achieved on the battle fronts." We offer here a brief estimate of the meaning of some of the decisions of this historic and important conference.

At first glance, many of the Conference pronouncements seem highly promising. It is not cynicism but sober realism that prompts the reminder that so did Wilson's Fourteen Points and the Covenant of the League of Nations.

What can be stated with most assurance is that the present regimes in the United States, Britain, Russia and China, have demonstrated that they are exceedingly anxious to bring the war to an early close, and to have a substantial breathing space after the war. The chances that this objective will be achieved have been considerably enhanced by the fact that the Conference finally was held, and by the nature of the actions taken in Moscow. For example, the likelihood that there will be a separate peace with any German regime on the part of the United States and Great Britain against Russia, or on the part of Russia against the former, is almost completely removed.

The likelihood of a break-up among the three major powers at the peace conference or conferences also has been reduced. This does not mean that all will be smooth going any more than at Versailles. There will be many matters over which verbal battles will be fought; there may even be troop movements to back up arguments, but there will be no break-up leading to immediate resumption of hostilities among the major powers.

Discouraging Aspects

If considerations such as these are in a measure encouraging, there are other aspects of the situation of which this is definitely not true. If the policy indicated by the Moscow Conference is carried out, the war will end in overwhelming military victory by one group of nations, and a peace dictated by them and imposed upon the vanquished. That will be a bad beginning for the building of a durable peace.

Assuming that Germany and Japan are at least temporarily eliminated from the roll of first-rate powers, there will be only three such left after this war—the United States, Russia and Great Britain. All other nations, despite what is said about their "sovereign equality," will be satellites to these. Do we have

evidence that they will use their preponderant power for the welfare of all peoples any more than the victors of Versailles did?

One evidence would be an attitude of true humility and repentance, a confession of a share in the guilt of the war. No such note is to be detected in the Moscow pronouncements. The Big Three think of themselves and the little nations on their side as the "peace-loving nations," and of the enemies as law-breakers and perpetrators of atrocities.

Another evidence of a better day coming would be plain, specific talk about difficult situations in which the Allies are involved. There was plain talk from Moscow about Italy, Austria and other nations occupied by Germany, but what did Molotov tell Hull and Eden, Russia was going to do about Finland, the Baltic states, Bessarabia, Dobrudja, Poland? What did Eden tell Molotov and Hull Britain was going to do about India, Burma, and other such cases? What did Hull tell Eden and Molotov about U. S. bases in the Philippines after all not-peace-loving nations have been subdued? Multitudes all over the world would have greeted with indescribable relief and joy the announcement that the victor nations were going to give liberty to these peoples and absolutely no strings attached. The failure to make the announcement can only mean that there was nothing of the sort to announce.

Moreover, no light was shed on what the economic and political organization of Europe is to be after the war. The nullification of the unification of Austria and Germany, and the implied promise of "independence" to other nations under German occupation or influence, by themselves certainly will solve nothing. Indeed to say this much, and then not to speak of the necessity of a unified economy for Europe, suggests all too strongly a program of keeping Germany down and keeping Europe divided with "spheres of influence" for this or that major power. It leaves the way open also for a series of clerical-fascist states under Roman Catholic influence, which seems to be one of the objects of the Vatican.

There is no hint as to what may have been said about Russian ambitions in the Balkans, the Mediterranean, the Near East, Iran, and in Mongolia. The same is true of British plans in the Near East, for the Arabs and the Jews; and of the disposition to be made of the Italian and French empires. Until we know something of what is to happen in these "hot spots" of the earth, we have no sure foundation on which to build hopes of peace, no spell with which to exorcise the spectre of World War III.

There are two references to arma-

tion, and neither one so much as hints at disarmament, nor even at turning military forces over to an international agency. Taken in the context of current developments, these broad statements hold out no more effective hope for ridding the world of the menace of competitive armament than the statements of 1914-19 were proved to contain.

No Word for Germans

Finally, and most important of all, in all the voluminous output of Moscow, there is not one clear word of hope for the German people, not one clear indication of a determination to deal with "the enemy" in an intelligent and humane fashion. There is not a single assurance that Germany will not again be saddled with "sole guilt" for the war. Was the term "Huns," in addition to "Hitlerites," which has hitherto in this war been so seldom used, introduced into the Statement on Atrocities for that express purpose? There is no word of assurance against dismemberment; against deprivation of territory; against indemnities; against forced draft of German labor to rebuild other countries; against a long-time military occupation; against being kept indefinitely out of the "general international organizations"; against the destruction of German industry or the crippling of German trade. It is explicitly stated in the Joint Communiqué that "questions concerning treatment of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites" were discussed. It seems inconceivable that, if there was agreement that the mistakes and crimes of the victors of World War I must be avoided and that there are such beings as non-Hitlerite Germans, something about that matter should not have been said to the latter and to the world.

The idea that the problem of peace is how nations can be kept from attacking each other—a police problem—was aptly described recently by Samuel Grafton, the *New York Post* columnist, as "very thin," with "more vinegar than blood in it." He continued: "Moral preachments about world order buzz about our ears, but it is thin stuff. How does one enforce a friendship? . . . The price of peace may once have been a police force; but in the incredibly changed world of today, the price of peace is peace itself; it includes the humility that will seek out friends and be friends." There is no convincing evidence provided by the Moscow Conference that the statesmen of the world have attained this wisdom. At the most, on the basis of present evidence, Moscow promises an Armistice, not Peace; an end of World War II, not a sure bulwark against World War III.

A. J. M.

Pro and Con

Stay In

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Conscription of any kind is to me entirely inconsistent with our pacifist faith. Only voluntary service lovingly and freely given can ever satisfy that faith. Nor could I, with my deep conviction, accept CPS camp if I were of the age to be called. I would go to jail. But I would never consider that jail was anything more than the last final stand of one who had been thwarted from making the kind of witness which a pacifist should make in such a world.

The pacifist witness in the last few years should not have been an isolated, individual last resort of those whose convictions led them to the so-called absolutist position, although such witness should never be minimized. If enough of the pacifists in the country had taken even that individual stand there would probably not have been a boy in jail or CPS camp and pacifism would be much more highly respected in the country as a whole than it now is.

But alert pacifism should have been ready when conscription first appeared on the horizon—long before Pearl Harbor—with a united front against conscription, a front which was not only a negative refusal to go to war, but a taking of the initiative in positive ways of opposing encroaching totalitarianism. Conscription is the united front of totalitarianism. This regimentation would have been the logical place for frontal attack on the whole totalitarian scheme. Pacifists should have organized their own united front by making demonstrations of positive pacifist ways of opposing the evils of Hitlerism. Attempts were made along this line by George Lansbury, Pierre Ceresole, the Quaker work camps, etc., but they were not backed by a united pacifist movement.

So we did not have *that* united front; but we did at last organize a united front, the first that American pacifism had ever had, in the form of NSBRO. This NSBRO limited and inadequate as it is, represents all that pacifism has so far been able to stand for unitedly vis a vis the Government. It ought not to be lightly discarded. Indeed, to discard it before pacifism has been able to build up its own positive corporate alternative to conscription would be very poor strategy.

I, therefore, consider that any attempt to change NSBRO which tends to divide us as pacifists, however sound it may seem in its details, would prove a definite backward step for the movement of pacifism as a whole. And for any one of the original member groups to withdraw at this stage from NSBRO by unilateral action, would be deplorable.

I believe that time may make necessary and wise the total repudiation of all the present arrangements for conscientious objection within the Selective Service frame. That time will be marked by the readiness to do together something that is more positive and more significant than anything that now appears possible. It can come only if we now adopt the strategy which I call "strategic cooperation," building ourselves up into united strength around the sound principle of voluntary service. In other words, while cooperating within our present united front to reveal that pacifists can administer competently that measure of

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

The National Council of the Fellowship this month must make an important decision on the issue of whether or not the FOR shall continue participation in the administration of Civilian Public Service camps through the National Service Board for Religious Objectors. To help FOR members to think through this question clearly, we are expanding this section to two pages in order to include several provocative letters.

self-control which is left in their hands, pacifists should be developing, wherever conscientious objectors are to be found (in jails, camps or outside, and composing men, women and children), the spirit of common purpose against conscription. This should mean the organizational forms of a new united front and the building up of a positive alternative to take the place of what we now have. In our loyalty to this united front, we should be ready to go to jail or otherwise to suffer, not individually as now but in *mass* struggle, by hundreds and thousands, if ever the time decrees that strategic cooperation within the present system can and should be replaced by non-violent non-cooperation to end both conscription and war. In such a struggle, in both cooperation and non-cooperation, the spirit is non-violence and the goal is to end war.

RALPH TEMPLIN

A Parallel

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

As chairman of a Presbytery Committee on Christian Education, which has care of candidates for the ministry and for their examinations for ordination, I have had a chance to see how the military forces, working through the church, are attempting to take over the education of ministers. And I think that the announcement of this new army and navy chaplaincy program is a striking parallel to the selective service—NSBRO—CPS set-up. They are both alike in this: the military forces want to control the policies, while they get their opponents to do the work; concerning the chaplaincy, they want the church to promise to ordain men who follow a curriculum laid down by the armed forces; concerning conscien-

tious objectors, they want the peace groups to provide and pay for a program whose ultimate control is in the hands of selective service.

JOSEPH W. JOHNSON

Withdraw

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Civilian Public Service has now been in operation for more than two years. Its history affords a chance to evaluate the following points: 1) the witness for pacifism which CPS has borne; 2) the opportunities for creative service which CPS has provided; 3) the likelihood of the future improvement of CPS.

1. CPS has failed to make a clear witness for pacifism. Many of us believed that the church agencies, if given sufficient freedom of action by Selective Service, could develop a program for conscientious objectors, the value of which would outweigh any compromise involved in the administrative arrangements. We must now frankly admit that this has not happened. Instead, Selective Service has steadily narrowed the area of administrative freedom and imposed a punitive disciplinary system upon CPS which has prevented the evolution of pacifist disciplinary techniques. But even worse than that, the church agencies have become embroiled in a joint coercive and punitive relationship in which they are allied with Selective Service against individual objectors. Unwillingly, the religious groups have thus been integrated more and more with the machinery of conscription.

2. CPS has a varied record of service with projects ranging from sheer boondoggling and made work to important social reconstruction. However, the large majority of COs are not engaged in socially strategic work nor in service of a uniquely pacifist nature. The detached service program has failed to reach a large number of men who have no specialized training nor college education. An important factor is the close control which Selective Service has exercised over the selection of projects, a control which has frustrated repeatedly the efforts of the churches to open new fields of endeavor. The recent Congressional ban upon foreign service and full-time reconstruction training has destroyed the most hopeful and encouraging phases of CPS work.

3. During the earlier stages of conscription, the prospects for CPS seemed bright. The unfolding program of detached and special service led us to have high hopes for the future. Those hopes have not been realized. Instead, the trend has been reversed, and present indications foreshadow steadily decreasing opportunities

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.; Midwest: Roger Axford, 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.; Northwest: Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; Northern California: Jean G. McKay, 1625 Buchanan Street, San Francisco, Cal.; Southwest: Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles, Cal.; Rocky Mountain: Margaret Rohrer, 440 East 13th Avenue, Denver 3, Colo.; Rural: Warren Nelson, Merom, Ind.; Refugee: Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

for COs. The increasing number of re-convictions of COs, prison treatment and parole limitations, the ignoring by Selective Service of the agreement with the church agencies in the unilateral transferring of men to the government camp, the Congressional action against foreign service and college training, the difficulties in public relations; these represent the direction in which government and public opinion are moving.

In the light of the above consideration I urge that the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the American Friends' Service Committee, and the Methodist Commission on World Peace (to each of which I have a definite relation) withdraw from membership on the National Service Board of Religious Objectors and from any administrative responsibilities for Civilian Public Service.

HERMAN WILL

Stay In

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

When I studied the FOR memorandum on the subject of NSBRO, I remembered Dr. Ralph Barton Perry's definition of the highest tragedy as "the conflict of two good wills." It is indeed tragic that good wills arrive at opposite conclusions on this subject, but we can hope that the boundaries of our common belief are big enough to encircle differences of opinion on subsidiary subjects.

This decision cannot be made ideologically. It is less a problem of subtle pacifist reasoning than it is the problem of what will happen to real people—to the ex-professor who has for three years weeded pine saplings, to the newspaper reporter whose savings have run out, to the fiancée of one man, to the new baby of another. Finely shaded controversy about "dictatorship" by Selective Service or whether camp projects are related to the war, are mere twitters beside the fact that the decision to end or continue CPS would drastically change the lives of real persons, who breathe and dream and hunger.

There are, of course, blatant faults in the present arrangement. One cannot observe them and say, with A. E. Housman, "Be still, my soul, and see injustice done." One cannot tolerate a soul-shrivelling situation in which capable men cannot support themselves, much less their families. These men are at an age where they should be marrying and making careers. Instead, they must borrow money from their parents in order to pay a visit home, must let their wives work, must dread the prospect of having children.

The farcical projects, the confusion of authority, all the other shortcomings of CPS have been discussed before, exhaustively and exhaustingly. Still, I believe that the agreement between the Service Committees and Selective Service should be renewed, and that the FOR should continue to support NSBRO, provided that these two changes are made:

1. That men on detached service receive the wages that are now paid into the United States Treasury. On farms, hospital projects and all other special services, they should be paid as civilian employees in the same place are paid. This would have an advantage beyond the important one of allowing men the self-respect that comes

of being financially independent. It would make detached service an incentive for which men in camps could aim, offering a stimulus for good work that is now lacking. (The army's system of promotions is psychologically shrewd—few men, even pacifists, have reached that high, dispassionate state where good work is reward in itself.)

2. That a plan be made with the United States Public Health Service to provide medical, dental and hospital care for CPS men, and that each man have regular physical check-ups at government expense.

Births are always painful. We must remember that CPS has a long way to go before it is even adolescent. It was an experiment without precedent, and if we have sometimes lost our way, it was because there were no signs blazed ahead. We, who hope to lead the world in what we consider to be a direction preferable to the one it now follows, have first to find our own way. If we turn back, it will seem to those who disagree with us that we will be unreliable leaders for greater expeditions. If we continue to make the best of a very bad situation, it will win more respect for our movement than any amount of oratory will.

The accomplishments of CPS are as quiet as those of Saint Boniface were, and may be as significant. CPS is one remaining repository of liberal arts study . . . while colleges are grimly turning out mechanics and meteorologists, Betsy Freeman at Powellsville, for instance, has been helping a group of men to read "The Divine Comedy" in Italian. CPS has helped men to discover the dynamic of service . . . ask the brusque Socialist who worked at Welfare Island how he felt the first time he lifted a patient into a wheelchair and heard a shy "Thank you, mister." In CPS, men have made priceless friends. They have known what it is to stride through winter woods on a bright day with an axe over their shoulder. They have learned to listen to silence. They have learned how to bake bread and peanut butter cookies. They may have learned more

than we can now surmise. Pondering the importance and the complexity of this decision, I can only send my prayers to those who must decide.

BETTY DODDS

A Plea for Forerunners

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I would like to call to the particular attention of every Fellowship member the vital importance of the new FOR-sponsored organization for high school age youth, the Forerunners. We have all heard about Forerunners, and I am sure that we all think it is a fine idea and wish it all the success in the world. But, is that *all* we have done about it? Have we really taken it seriously? I know there are many FOR members whose regular job is to deal with young people around high school age—parents, ministers, teachers, social workers, etc. But how many of us have taken advantage of this golden opportunity? How many of us have in our possession some of the excellent Forerunners literature, and, what is more, have read it and used it? Much time and skill has gone into this material and it should not go to waste.

Ever since I joined the Fellowship at the age of 15—not so long ago—I have had a deep concern that it develop some sort of method of meeting the average high school student on his own ground. Now, at last, we have produced just such a means, and I want to see some real action. We have progressed this far; let's not stop here. If we really mean business in paving the way for a better world, one of our main points of attack is to reach this youth during the years when the ideas are formed that will direct their entire lives. They are going to populate the world tomorrow. If our ideals are important enough, we'll try to lead those that follow us along those lines.

ANNETTE RICHARDS

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912 AND MARCH 3, 1933. Of *Fellowship* published monthly, at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1943.

STATE OF New York }
COUNTY OF New York } ss:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared John Nevin Sayre, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the editor of the *Fellowship* magazine, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Fellowship of Reconciliation, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.; Editors, John Nevin Sayre and A. J. Muste, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.; Managing Editor, R. Alfred Hassler, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.; Business Manager, None.

2. That the owner is: Fellowship of Reconciliation, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.; Phillips P. Elliott, Chairman, 124 Henry Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; A. J. Muste, and John Nevin Sayre, Secretaries, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.; and J. Passmore Elkinton, Treasurer, Moylan, Pennsylvania.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation the name of the person or corporation for whom such full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him,

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE
Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 5th day of October, 1943.

BURT H. FALL

(Seal)

My commission expires March 30, 1945.

In the genuine spirit of Christmas



Commercialization and war have combined to cheapen and degrade the spirit of Christmas giving and the gifts themselves. At this war-time Christmas, the gift of a carefully chosen book from this recommended list, or of a subscription to *Fellowship*, will help to spread the spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Gifts that speak of 'Peace on Earth'

Choose one of these gifts to suit the personality and needs of each of your friends. An attractive gift card will accompany each package. Please order *immediately*, since delays in the postal system otherwise may hold up delivery until after Christmas.

WITH THE MASTER

Philippe Vernier's beautiful meditations are now in the third printing. "A 'must' in the field of meditation," says *Motive*. .75

HUMILIATION WITH HONOR

Vera Brittain's moving statement of pacifist faith is in its second printing. The *New York Times* said of it: "... makes more sense than what we have now." \$1.00

THE FALL OF CHRISTIANITY

Unexpectedly delayed by labor shortage, this book will be ready for delivery December 10. An excellent gift for minister or theological student. By *G. J. Heering*, with an introduction by *E. Stanley Jones*. \$1.50

BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN

Carey McWilliams' book is just the gift for the friend who isn't quite convinced of the evils of racial injustice. \$3.00

NEW WORLD A'COMING

The absorbing story of America's tenth man—the Negro—and his long struggle for freedom. An invaluable reference book. By *Roi Outley*. \$2.50

FELLOWSHIP

For the friend who's beginning to wonder about the war. Also for public and school libraries, ministers, teachers, etc. Regular one-year price, \$1.50; special Christmas gift price, twelve issues for \$1.00

FELLOWSHIP STUDYBOOKS

The FOR's newest venture—read the details elsewhere in this issue. Subscription to 5 books . . . \$1.00

OUTCASTS

Set aside a dollar or so to spread an understanding of our Japanese-American citizens among teachers, ministers, political office-holders, and friends. *Caleb Foote's* fine illustrated booklet is, per copy, .15

DO YOU KNOW LABOR?

James Myers' unbiased discussion of the crucial labor situation in America. Just the thing for the friend who "sees red" when unions are mentioned. \$1.00

INTO THE WAY OF PEACE

We thought this fine book by 11 *British pacifists* had been sold out, but we have located just 75 more copies. Written during England's "blitz." \$1.25

Still a Few Copies Left

There are still a few copies of *William Lloyd Garrison on Non-Violence*. While they last, a copy will be included with each purchase of \$2.00 or more, free. Please specify whether this book is to be sent with gift order, or to you.

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.